

As has been indicated by others, the number of reports, the number of times we must file the same kind of material. If I could add to the complication that someone has pointed to here dealing with two or three kinds of Federal grants—we do our construction in Illinois under an Illinois Building Authority which is a bond-selling organization. They too have sets of regulations so that the sheer paperwork, the number of times and the number of different ways in which we must explain what we are doing, adds months to our construction projects.

It is not a matter of reflecting any feeling that we are interfered with when we are dealing with, let's say, academic matters or institute programs. But I was reflecting—perhaps lack of trust is not a good way to put it except this is almost the way we have to look at it. When we are asked the same questions over and over again we begin to wonder, can't we make some of these decisions once and not make them over and over again?

Mr. QUIE. Do you think there is some way they could determine which institutions would be qualified to make those kinds of management decisions?

Mr. ERIC JOHNSON. Not complete analogy, in the same direction. Somebody said schools were covered for years under the whip of credentialing, to some extent higher education, but mostly elementary and secondary education.

There is no doubt that the credentialing of teachers in the school stems from a time when you simply could not trust boards of education to do what they should do in the way of hiring qualified people. We are a long, long way past that in this State and in other States. The way we do much of this now is we qualify a program once, and then we say that the institution is to be trusted to put people through this program and therefore we will "credential" the people who come out, not individually but as they pass through a program. This would be a direction we might want to think about.

We might want to qualify a program, we might want to qualify a State, we might want to qualify institutions. Leave the followup to be as precise as necessary in terms of auditing the expenditure of the Federal dollar, but that we see this as a possible way of reducing this leadtime. It is the leadtime that bothers us more than anything else in working with Federal programs, working with Federal dollars.

Mr. QUIE. I might add to this, and I appreciate your clearing this up for me through this question of trust, that, from testimony before, the supervision given by the Department of Housing and Urban Development over academic facilities grants to construct buildings, it seems to me that is way out of line and I don't blame the institutions for being upset about that kind of constant duplication of supervision that is being given.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSON. If I could give just another example, there was a recent construction project which we didn't get cleared, and as I say we had a tremendous amount of cooperation both at the regional level and in Washington. But when we finally got geared on the project it had gone through every agency it could go through, and then it faced this final test of when it would be appropriate to bid it.

The waiting time on whether or not the word would come from Washington on whether this was appropriate to bid, and it had to do